



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/011,947 02/01/93 PASTRICK

DON01-P-530

POSITIV, C EXAMINER

04M1/0823

PRICE, HANEVELD, COOPER, DENITT & LITTON  
693 KENMOOR DRIVE, S.E.  
P. O. BOX 2567  
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

0400

DATE MAILED 08/23/93

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
- ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐ \_\_\_\_\_

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.

3. ☒ Claims 20-24 are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11 and 18 are rejected.

5. ☒ Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12-17 and 19 are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 3406

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vu ('430) in view of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al.

To substitute for the switch 42 of Vu a base unit switch controlled by a transmitter as used in the locking system of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art and is seen as producing no new or unexpected results. Remote controlled switches are well known in the art and have multiple uses as desired. In regard to claim 4, to include a vehicle interior light circuit to be operated by the base unit and transmitter of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al would appear to be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skill in the art and

Serial No. 011,947

-3-

Art Unit 3406

is seen as producing no new or unexpected results.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 61-188242 in view of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al.

To substitute for the switch 40 in the Japanese patent a base unit switch controlled by a transmitter as used in the locking system of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art. In regard to claim 4, to include a vehicle interior light circuit to be operated by the base unit and transmitter of Lambropoulos et al and Hirano et al would appear to be an obvious matter of choice to one of ordinary skilled in the art.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12-17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.



C. DORITY:lm  
August 17, 1993  
703-308-1437

**CARROLL B. DORITY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 346**